

# Final Minutes



## Ambient Monitoring Strategic Planning Team Meeting #23

**Date:** Tuesday April 10, 2007

**Time:** 9:30 – 3:30

**Place:** CASA office  
10035 – 108 Street  
Edmonton, Alberta

10035 108 ST NW FLR 10  
EDMONTON AB T5J 3E1  
CANADA

Ph (780) 427-9793  
Fax (780) 422-3127  
Email casa@casahome.org  
Web www.casahome.org

### In attendance:

Name	Organization
Matthew Dance	Clean Air Strategic Alliance
Jillian Flett	CASA
Brian Free	CASA
Bob Myrick	Alberta Environment
Bettina Mueller	Alberta Environment
Ian Peace	RAPID
Roxanne Pettipas	ConocoPhillips Canada / Canadian Assoc. of Petroleum Producers
Kim Sanderson	CASA
Chris Severson-Baker	Pembina Institute
David Spink	Cumulative Environmental Management Assoc.
Kevin Warren	Parkland Airshed
Brian Wiens	Environment Canada

### Regrets:

Name	Organization
Rob Bioletti	Alberta Environment
Findlay MacDermid	RAPID
David McCoy	Husky Oil / Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers
Keith Murray	Alberta Forest Products Association
Ken Omotani	TransAlta Utilities
Mike Pawlicki	Lafarge Canada Inc.
Mike Queenan	RAPID
Merry Turtiak	Alberta Health and Wellness
James Vaughan	Alberta Energy and Utilities Board
B.J. Vickery	Lafarge Canada Inc / Alberta Chamber of Resources

### Action Items:

Task	Who	When
9.2: Load the information to the CASA website and provide the working group with access information.	Matthew Dance	Ongoing
18.8: Compile a short document that cross-references workshop questions to sections of the report where these questions are addressed, or to other documents as appropriate.	Matthew Dance	Carry forward
21.1: Bob Myrick will consult with AENV regarding any regulatory policy requirements	Bob Myrick	Carry forward

# Final Minutes

Task	Who	When
that should be included in the strategic plan, and report back to the team on his discussions.		
21.5: Brian Wiens and Bettina Mueller will contact the US EPA to learn more about the work they are doing on air monitoring network design.	Brian Wiens and Bettina Mueller	Carry forward
22.3: Bob Myrick will send Brian Free the associated text for the latest Figure 3.	Bob Myrick	Carry forward
23.1 Brian Free will follow up with Merry Turtiak to get her comments on the draft report.	Brian	For next meeting
23.2: A document will be created to house the suggestions from the Operations Steering Committee.	Brian Free	ASAP
23.3: Kim Sanderson will pull out the context from the current draft to fit the proposed outline	Kim Sanderson	ASAP
23.4: The ad hoc committee will make a first cut at the “companion document”.	Brian Weins, Bettina Mueller, David Spink, Matthew Dance, Kim Sanderson	For next meeting
23.5: Proposed funding principles will be compiled for the Team’s consideration.	Matthew Dance, Kim Sanderson, Brian Free	For next meeting.
23.6: Matthew will poll the team for meeting dates in early May and early June.	Matthew Dance	ASAP

Bob Myrick convened the meeting at 9:40 am.

Brian Weins joined at about 10:30am. Ian Peace joined at about 10:45am

## 1. Administration

### a. Introductions

Introductions were made informally. Bob Myrick reported that Merry Turtiak of Alberta Health and Wellness does have comments on the current draft report, but illness prevented her attendance. Brian Free agreed to follow up with her to get her comments.

**Action Item 23.1 Brian Free will touch base with Merry Turtiak, Alberta Health a& Wellness, to obtain her comments on the March 26 draft.**

### b. Approve agenda and meeting purpose

The meeting purpose was approved.

The agenda was approved with the following changes: Item 6 (Review of March 26 draft) was moved up to follow Item 2.

# Final Minutes

## c. Approve minutes

The March-12 Minutes (Meeting 22) were approved as distributed.

## d. Review action items

**9.2:** Matthew to load the data to the CASA web site and provide the working group with access information. **Ongoing.**

- This refers to general information and not air quality data.

**14.1:** Matthew to forward the parameters that are included in the SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> forecasts to the team. **Done.**

- Bob Myrick has provided this to CASA and Matthew will forward it to the team.

**18.8:** Matthew to compile a short document that cross-references workshop questions to sections of the report where these questions are addressed, or to other documents as appropriate. **Carry forward.**

- Matthew is awaiting a more “near-to final” draft before cross-referencing.

**21.1:** Bob Myrick will continue to investigate the regulatory requirements of the proposed system. **Carry forward.**

- Bettina explained that AENV needs to be assured that their monitoring requirements with respect to approvals, inter-jurisdictional agreements, and so on, will be met by the proposed system. Further consultation within the department is still needed.
- This action item will be re-worded to ask Bob to report back to this team with the results of consultation within the department.

**21.5:** Brian Wiens and Bettina Mueller will contact the US EPA to learn more about the work they are doing on air monitoring network design. **Carry forward.**

- Bettina suggested that this may be covered by the work of Dr. Neil Cape. However, she has a clearer idea of what to ask the EPA and will follow-up with them.

**21.6:** Roxanne Pettipas will create a summary of the highlights of the Jurisdictional Review. **Done.**

- Roxanne has completed the summary and this will be forwarded to the team.

**21.7:** Bob Myrick will provide the Operations Steering Committee with an update on our strategic plan and will report back any suggestions they may offer. Brian Free will make arrangements for the OSC meeting. **Done.**

**22.1:** Brian Free will follow up with AB Health & Wellness to confirm their level of interest and involvement. **Done.**

- Brian talked to Merry Turtiak and she confirmed her department’s strong interest in this team.

# Final Minutes

**22.2:** David Spink and Bob Myrick will prepare an email to Dr. Neil Cape to describe in more detail, the services this team is seeking. **Done.**

**22.3:** Bob Myrick will send Brian Free the latest Figure 3 and associated text. **Carry Forward.**

- Bob has sent the figure, but not the associated text.

**22.4** David Spink will send Brian Free the RWDI report. **Done.**

- David sent the report to Matthew.

**22.5:** Brian Free/Matthew Dance to ask Brian Weins to fill out this table and add more text. **Done.**

- Brian Weins has completed the table as best as he can. Bob Myrick suggested that the team fill it in when we discuss that section of the report.

**22.6:** The team's recommendation regarding the preferred system management model will be added to the Agenda for the next team meeting. **Done.**

**22.7:** New agenda item for team's next meeting -- Funding. **Done.**

**22.8:** Kim Sanderson will contact the Pembina Institute for existing information about funding approaches in other jurisdictions. **Done.**

- Chris Severson-Baker briefly described some of the possible funding approaches, such as charges for waste and consumption taxes. He suggested that this is a larger issue that would be suitable for a Statement of Opportunity for the CASA Board's consideration.
- This might also be addressed in the Clean Air Strategy that is up for renewal.
- It is important to have Industry on board in order to sell this to Government.

## 2. Feedback from Operations Steering Committee

Brian reviewed the Minutes from the April 2 Operations Steering Committee meeting at which Bob Myrick presented this team's current thinking about the Ambient Monitoring Strategy. The OSC was very interested and provided several suggestions, as follows:

- In Monitoring Objective 5, the OSC has suggested we drop reference to industry as a pollution source, since there are many other sources of emissions.
- The OSC suggested we split Objective 7 into two; one for CASA frameworks and one for State of the Environment reporting.
- The pie chart on page 48 of the March 26<sup>th</sup> draft report illustrates the funding contributions of government, industry, etc should also show the industry contribution through the airsheds.
- General support for the multi-stakeholder approach, although some felt that AENV was well positioned to lead the implementation.
- The OSC, with some modification to membership, could fulfill the role of the "multi-stakeholder group".
- The OSC wants to review the draft strategy by June, in order to provide meaningful input before it goes to the CASA Board.

# Final Minutes

## AMSP Team Discussion

- The input from the OSC should be kept in a “parking lot” to which input from other stakeholders will be also be added for future consideration.
- For Objective 5, some AMSP Team members felt that it is important to keep the focus of this objective on source allocation. Other emission sources are covered by Objective 8.
- In Objective 7, we could refer more generally to “relevant frameworks and obligations” instead of just CASA Frameworks. We need to capture obligations in inter-provincial and other types of agreements.

**Action Item 23.2: A document will be created to house the suggestions from the Operations Steering Committee.**

## **3. Review of March 26 draft report**

Moving around the table, team members provided their high-level impressions of the current draft. The following comments were made by team members:

- A standard format is needed for the recommendations. There is some confusion as to who is supposed to do some of them. It was noted that the recommendations as written as simply ideas to explore and may not be included in the final report.
- Care should be used in the use of words like “should” and “will”.
- This draft contains a lot of good information and detail.
- A mechanism described to allow implementation to accommodate changes in circumstances should be developed to allow for a dynamic approach to implementation.
- The report should include a description of the current situation.
- The strategy should be separate from the implementation details.
- Some information in the appendices about the current situation should be brought into the main report.
- Too much detail about population-based management. For example, we shouldn’t get into the specifics for Edmonton and Calgary.
- It is unclear to whom some of the recommendations are directed.
- Need to more clearly define what we mean by “implementation”. Can we describe what implementation will look like?
- This draft has a much better structure.
- Simplify the purpose of the strategy:
  1. What substances need to be monitored?
  2. How will the data be collected?
  3. What will be done with the data?
- Need to be clear about jurisdictional responsibilities: Who should do what?
- Has a very good impression of the current draft, and agrees with many of the comments already offered around the table.

## **Lunch**

- An ad hoc group was formed to discuss the options the team should consider to move this report forward.

# Final Minutes

## Ad Hoc Committee Report

The ad hoc committee recommended to the team that two documents be produced:

- 1) The strategic plan and process. This is a short document, written at a high level.
- 2) A companion implementation document that reflects a 'dry run' of the process proposed above.

## Outline for the proposed Strategic Plan and Process

Principles

Context for the 2007 Plan – a two-pager

Purpose / Objectives of the Plan

Process / Mechanism Description

- Network design considerations
- System management
- Data and information

## Discussion

- The team should move forward with the companion document and not wait for completion of the strategic document.
- There may be some confusion with two documents. Need to cross reference.
- Both documents should be made available at the same time.

## Brainstorming remaining gaps in the report

- Jurisdictional responsibilities should be clarified in the section about Systems Management.
- The Team's terms of reference requests that performance measures be suggested.
- Still need to explain what needs to be monitored. Include a decision tree.
- Include funding priorities under Systems Management. Where are limited financial resources directed?
- Need to explain how we intend to include "risk-based" management.

**Action Item 23.3: Kim Sanderson will pull out the context to fit the proposed outline**

**Action Item 23.4: The ad hoc committee will make a first cut at the "companion document"**

## **4. Funding the Air Monitoring System**

The report should contain two kinds of funding recommendations that address both capital and operation costs.:

- 1) Near-term, moving forward from today
- 2) Long term

The team brainstormed some funding principles:

- Polluter Pay (direct and indirect polluters)
- Pay in proportion to contribution to pollution at the local and regional level. Not just point sources.
- Include organizations that need the data, e.g. AB Health & Wellness, Environment Canada, AENV and those making special requests. The general public and researchers should have relatively free access to the data.

# Final Minutes

- Note that the CCME sub-agreement on monitoring may have some useful principles to consider.
- Principles of fairness and reason should be included.
- Add a principle of rewarding good behaviour.

**Action Item 23.5: Matthew Dance, Kim Sanderson and Brian Free will compile the funding principles for the Team's consideration.**

## 5. System Management Model

The three systems management models outlined in the March draft of the report( Status Quo, Multi-stakeholder Group, Traditional) were reviewed and discussed.

### Discussion

- None of these models are the exact, preferred choice. This team will likely suggest a hybrid.
- The current Acid Deposition Assessment Group is based largely on the Traditional Approach and seems to work well. This approach has AENV in the lead role with a multi-stakeholder group providing advice.
- An advantage of the Traditional Approach is that one agency has clear responsibility for implementing the monitoring system. If stakeholders are unhappy with the way things are going, they will have an opportunity to express their concerns when the entire system comes up for review.
- Suggest we simply revise the paragraph describing the Traditional Approach. Replace “working groups” with “multi-stakeholder committee” and have it provide “direction”, rather than “advice”.
- It was suggested that a modified Traditional Approach may be appropriate with AENV as the lead agency supporting a consensus-based multi-stakeholder committee providing direction.
- The Operations Steering Committee may fulfill the role of the multi-stakeholder committee with some modification of the members to include a more strategic perspective. The OSC terms of reference may already be sufficiently broad to accommodate this new role.
- This team should recommend the specific role for the Multi-Stakeholder Committee and then let the OSC revise their own terms of reference, if necessary. The MSC will have to figure out how to address the responsibilities outlined in the diagram in the report, e.g. funding, communications, data handling, etc.

## 6. Next Meeting

Agenda items for the next meeting include:

- Need to decide how broader stakeholder input will be obtained.
- Reviewing a document or a fall workshop?
- Nail down the outline for the companion document on implementation.

**Action Item 23.6: Matthew will poll the team for meeting dates in early May and early June.**

This meeting adjourned at about 3:30pm.